DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 260 746 JC 850 458

AUTHOR Kester, Donald L.; Richart, Victoria
TITLE Why Has This Comprehensive Evaluation System Been So Successful for So Long (Eight Years)? Here Is a Retrospective Attempt to Explain the Uncommon, Long Run Success of the Evaluation System for the One-to-Two-Million-Dollars-a-Year Handicap Program in the Nine Colleges of the Los Angeles Community College District (as Begun in Fiscal Year 1977-78).
INSTITUTION Los Angeles Community Coll. District, Calif.; Los Angeles County Office of Education, Downey, CA.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 60p.; Document includes abstracts for three related documents: ED 148 451, ED 224 508, and ED 247 977.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Environment; Community Colleges; Disabilities; Evaluation Methods; Force Field Analysis; Institutional Characteristics; *Multicampus Districts; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; *Special Education; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

Reasons for the long-range success of the Los Angeles Community College District's evaluation system for its handicap program are explored in this report, using a force field analysis of facilitating and restraining factors. First, introductory material cites previous reports exploring various aspects of the evaluation system. Next, the following five major predisposing factors are analyzed as reasons for the success of the evaluation system: (1) the program's evaluation system was seen as "invented here by us, the major players," i.e., by the district administrator and each of the nine campus coordinators; (2) there was an adequate level of trust between all the major players; (3) there existed at least three supportive organizational factors (i.e., special funding that required accountability, a manageable span of control, and line authority on the part of the 10 program managers); (4) the nine different forms of resistance to innovation were overcome; and (5) there was a readiness for innovation. Each of these factors is discussed in terms of the results of the force field analysis and with reference to relevant literature on the implementation of innovations in general and program evaluations in particular. Appendices provide additional material on the force field analysis, the comprehensive evaluation services within the district, an outline of conditions related to readiness for change by cluster, and a three-page bibliography. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED260746

WHY HAS THIS COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION SYSTEM BEEN SO SUCCESSFUL FOR SO LONG (eight years)?

Here is a Retrospective Attempt to Explain the Uncommon, Long Run Success of the Evaluation System for the One-To-Two-Million-Dollars-a-Year Handicap Program in The Nine Colleges of the Los Angeles Community College District (as begun in Fiscal Year 1977-78)

by

Donald L. Kester, Ph.D.
Consultant
Program Evaluation, Audit, and Research
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Downey, California

and

Victoria Richart, M.Ed.
Assistant Director of Student Programs
Los Angeles Community College District
Los Angeles, California

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
V. Richart

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 850 458

The authors of this paper presented an introductory paper that briefly described the evaluation system and what it was designed to do. That paper was given at the Annual California Educational Research Association's Fall, 1977 conference. Its title was, "This Model Management and Evaluation System of a Large $1.5 Million Program for Handicapped Students in All Nine Los Angeles Community Colleges Provides Both Cost-Benefit and Program Quality Information" (ERIC ED 148 451).

Dr. Kester presented papers related to this current one at the Annual International School Psychology Colloquiums (ISPC) held at: The University of York in York, England on July 10, 1979; the University of Stockholm, Stockholm, Sweden on August 3, 1982; and the University of Orleans at Orleans, France on July 3, 1984.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	3
INTRODUCTION	7
Part 1 - Orientation and Predisposing Factor #1	9
Part 2 - Predisposing Factor #2	15
Part 3 - Predisposing Factor #3	19
Part 4 - Predisposing Factor #4	22
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	45
Appendix 1 - Force Field Analysis and Factors	46
Appendix 2 - Comprehensive Evaluation Services	47
Appendix 3 - Conditions Related to Readiness for Change	52
SPECIFIC BIBLIOGRAPHY	54
GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY	57

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

During the 1976-77 academic year, Victoria Richart, the administrator responsible for the Los Angeles community college district's program for all handicapped students in the district's nine colleges, saw the need to establish a comprehensive management and evaluation system for that program. She established a district level handicap program management and evaluation planning committee that included herself and all nine of the campus coordinators. In addition, she contacted Dr. Donald Kester, a program evaluation consultant from the Los Angeles County Office of Education, and Dr. Ray Pitts, the Dean of Academic Affairs of the state chancellor's office of the California community colleges. Dr. Kester agreed to provide consultant assistance, not only during the evaluation plan development but also during the plan's future implementation. Dr. Pitts agreed to meet with the planning committee and describe those evaluation elements that the chancellor's office recommended be included. Early in the evaluation planning stage, that meeting with Dr. Pitts did take place at Los Angeles Harbor College. Those who attended that Harbor College meeting included Dr. Pitts, Dr. Kester, Victoria Richart, and all nine of the campus coordinators of handicapped programs.

After the Harbor College planning meeting, and after a careful reading of the law and regulations related to the education of the handicapped, and with on-going consultant input from Dr. Kester, Victoria Richart developed a first draft of an extensive evaluation plan. She then presented that draft to the district's handicap management evaluation planning committee for their review, criticism, and suggestions for revision

All nine campus coordinators and Dr. Kester attended that plan rewriting meeting held at Los Angeles Valley College. At that meeting, the campus coordinators immediately took a very active role in suggesting revisions as a way of bringing the evaluation plan into congruence with what they were doing or felt they should be doing. During that exhausting day, Victoria Richart acted as chair of the committee and as district administrator she overruled some suggestions for revision (with an explanation of why), accepted others,

and negotiated on others. Dr. Kester was active by providing an outsider's view, which tended to require a level of clarity of the program's objectives that later helped make the results of the evaluation more understandable to those who worked outside the handicap program and services field.

During that marathon, one-day management and evaluation plan rewriting meeting at Los Angeles Valley College, consensus was reached on a majority of the program objectives, either as initially written by Victoria Richart or as revised during that day. However, consensus could not be reached on other objectives. Consequently, when rewording an objective became so difficult and time-consuming as to make it impossible to accomplish during that meeting, rewording was referred to a subcommittee composed of from two to four people, including the district administrator. Later, when that subcommittee submitted its suggestions for rewording, the committee of the whole writing team found it easy to accept or revise program objectives to their satisfaction. Finally, all objectives had been written or rewritten in such a way that all of them were officially acceptable to the entire handicap management and evaluation plan writing committee.

The professionals who put the first Handicap Program Evaluation Plan together and who implemented it over the following two years (1977-78 and 1978-79) are hereby acknowledged and thanked.

At the Campus Level

- Burton Amos
  Coordinator
  Program for the Handicapped
  West Los Angeles College
  Culver City, California

- Henryette Fisher
  Coordinator
  Program for the Handicapped
  Los Angeles Southwest College
  Los Angeles, California

- Ronnie Fisher
  Coordinator
  Program for the Handicapped
  Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
  Los Angeles, California

- Steven Harshfield
  Coordinator
  Program for the Handicapped
  Los Angeles Harbor College
  Wilmington, California

- Jack Kearney (1977-78) and Sally Smith (1978-79)
  Coordinator
  Program for the Handicapped
  Los Angeles Mission College
  San Fernando, California

- George Kopoulos
  Coordinator
  Program for the Handicapped
  Los Angeles Valley College
  Van Nuys, California

- Jim Lagerstrom
  Coordinator
  Program for the Handicapped
  Los Angeles Pierce College
  Woodland Hills, California

- Jack Oliver
  Coordinator
  Program for the Handicapped
  East Los Angeles College
  Monterey Park, California

- Chadwick Woo, Jr
  Coordinator
  Program for the Handicapped
  Los Angeles City College
  Los Angeles, California

At the District Level

- Victoria Richart
  Assistant Director of Student Programs
  Los Angeles Community College District
  Los Angeles, California

From the County Office

- Dr. Donald L. Kester
  Consultant
  Program Evaluation, Audit, and Research
  Los Angeles County Office of Education
  Downey, California

Also to be acknowledged and thanked for his initial guidance and continuing interest in the development of the evaluation system is:

From the State Chancellor's Office

- Dr. Ray Pitts
  Dean of Academic Affairs
  Chancellor's Office
  California Community Colleges
  Sacramento, California

In addition, it must be noted here that the district's Handicap Program enjoyed "100% support" from the highest levels of district management. Above Victoria Richart there have been two Vice Chancellors, Dr. John McCuen and Dr. Kenneth Washington both of whom were very supportive. Moreover, the district's chancellor, Dr. Leslie Koltai, and members of the board have consistently demonstrated their total support.

By the Fall of 1978, members of the state chancellor's staff were giving high praise for the evaluation system that had evolved in Los Angeles. So much so that some were recommending that other California community college districts and colleges review it for ideas that they could use to improve their own handicap management and evaluation plan.

Bernice Robinson and Anita Fuller, Dr. Kester's former secretaries, must be thanked for typing early drafts of this report. Diana Mendoza must be thanked for typing this report in its final form.

INTRODUCTION

This paper is directly related to three earlier papers that are already in the ERIC system and to a number of papers that are currently "in press." The earliest paper in this series as mentioned on the title page, was written in 1977 and was entitled, "This Model Management and Evaluation System of a Large $1.5 Million Program for Handicapped Students in All Nine Los Angeles Community Colleges Provides Both Cost Benefit Analysis and Program Quality Information" (in ERIC ED 148 451; date, 1977). That initial paper provided a general overview of the evaluation plan; and a few examples of the goals and objectives as initially written. It was, therefore, a description what was hoped would happen in the future. As it turned out, implementation was successful, owing somewhat to the dress rehearsal experiences provided to managers and staff as described in this current paper.

The second ERIC paper that is directly related to this one was entitled, "Showing Off What We Do and How Well We Do It: or How The Child Development Center Program at Nine Los Angeles Community Colleges Demonstrates Accountability" (in ERIC ED 224 508; date, 1982). This second paper demonstrates the record of the progress that was made in the Child Development Program as a result of applying the same management-by-objectives (MBO) approach that was used to build the district's Handicap Evaluation Plan.

A third report (in ERIC ED 247 977; date, 1984) is also directly related to this one. The title of that report was, "Possible Reasons for the Successes and Difficulties Involved in the Development and Attempted Implementation of a Counseling Evaluation Plan for Nine Colleges of the Los Angeles Community College District." In that third paper is a description of the progress and/or lack of progress made when the MBO approach (that had been so successful with the handicap program) was attempted for the district's counseling program. As described in that paper and the current one, the handicap program's evaluation system turned out to be the most successful and the counseling program's evaluation system the least successful. This difference of success rates among three student service programs (Handicap, Child Development, and Counseling) in operation in the same district prompted a search for possible reasons why such

a difference would exist. That search resulted in the writing of the 1984 paper and this one.

In the 1984 paper, the differential success rates were examined in the light of: (1) three organizational factors that varied between the three programs, the way the different programs (2) resisted innovation and had (3) a readiness for innovation. In this paper, the hypothesized reasons for the different success rates included the main three used above in the 1984 paper but, also included two more. Included here for the first time is (4) an "invented here" factor and (5) a measure of "trust" factor. These latter two factors were gleaned from journal articles while the first three come from a monograph entitled, "Diagnosing a School's Readiness for Change: What to Look for When Starting an Innovation" (Bell, Wyant, and Schumuck, 1979).

In the future, the current writers plan to place a number of related documents into the ERIC system. Because by definition an evaluation system includes the existence of an evaluation plan that lists the goals and objectives of the program and an evaluation report that states the results of the program over the last year or two in terms of which program objectives were attained and which were not; the current writers plan to submit examples of the handicap evaluation plans and handicap evaluation reports that have been produced over the last eight years, 1977-1985.

SOME LIKELY PREDISPOSING FACTORS IMPORTANT TO THE UNCOMMON SUCCESS OF THE HANDICAP PROGRAM'S MANAGEMENT AND EVALUATION SYSTEM.

Part 1: Orientation and Predisposing Factor #1

In this paper, some educated guesses will be made in answer to the question, "Why has this program's evaluation system been so successful for so long?" A number of predisposing factors will be suggested. These early factors, that are now hypothesized as being among those that predisposed Los Angeles Community College District's Handicap Evaluation System toward long-term success, are shown below in no particular order:

Probable Predisposing Factors:

1. The program's evaluation system was seen as "invented here by us" the "major players"--that is, by the district administrator and each of the nine campus coordinators,

2. There was an adequate level of trust between all the major players,

3. There existed at least three supportive organizational factors,

4. The different forms of "resistance to innovation" were overcome, and

5. There was a "readiness for innovation."

The current writers concede that the entries in the above list are not mutually exclusive; in fact, we recognize that they often overlap and interrelate. Nevertheless, we feel that these factors are worth exploring, since what is offered here in this paper is not a scientifically developed, consistently worded, theory in its final form, but rather a listing of some hopefully relevant ideas, chosen from the literature on the implementation of

innovations in general and program evaluation planning in particular. We hope that these ideas or factors will turn out to be predictive of an Evaluation System's Long Run Success Level.

If it is true, as suggested here, that these factors do, in fact, bear upon the future success or failure of an evaluation system being developed, then those who plan other evaluations should be able to use these ideas--early--to test whether the evaluation they plan has a good chance of being implemented and surviving over a long term. Is this important? The authors feel that, "Yes, it is very important for all of us who plan evaluations to be as efficient as possible." The authors believe that utilizing these factors (and others as locally identified if needed) to estimate an evaluation system's probable long range success level--and to do so early in the evaluation planning stage is an important activity that cannot help but force us to be more efficient in our work. We should make every effort to avoid those situations in which we work for days, weeks, or months assisting in the development of goals and measurable objectives and succeed in building a good program evaluation plan only to later see that plan fail to be implemented because the combined force of predisposing factors such as these acted to obstruct that hoped for implementation. Certainly developing a good evaluation plan is less than half the battle. Better that evaluation planners have fewer evaluation plans written and more such plans both written and implemented. To achieve a higher program implementation rate in the future is to become more efficient in our work. Clearly, what we need is a good forecasting method.

Elsewhere, (Donald Kester, Victoria Richart, and others, 1983; in ERIC ED 247 977) the current writers have recommended that factors which predict an evaluation system's long range success (if they could be identified) could be used in a rough force-field analysis; and this procedure is recommended here in this paper as well. Such a forecasting analysis need not be very formal--it could be roughly done in longhand on a sheet of paper and that sheet dated, signed, and placed in the folder with other documents related to the planning of that evaluation system. If the evaluator's estimates indicated that the planned system was unlikely to be implemented successfully, he could show his method and results to the others involved in the planning. After discussion, a decision could be reached as to whether or not to proceed.

Specifically, how could predisposing factors, such as those five listed above, and the force-field analysis be combined, and how would that procedure lead to an estimation that the implementation of an evaluation plan was either unlikely or likely to occur? To answer this question, we will first need to review force-field analysis and then add our five predisposing factors as forces to it.

Force-field analysis involves viewing the current situation--planning a program evaluation, for example--as being held stationary by two sets of opposing forces. The current state of affairs is shown as a line, in this case a vertical one, on which the opposing forces act (shown in Table 1). Forces act on this line to push it one way or another, in this case to the left or right. These forces are referred to as either facilitating forces or restraining forces. Forces are called facilitating if they act to move the current situation line toward a more desirable state; i.e., toward evaluation plan implementation. Conversely, forces are called restraining if they act to impede the move to a more desirable state; i.e., toward evaluation plan implementation. A typical force-field analysis diagram is shown in Table 1. (Schmuck, Richard and others. The Second Handbook of Organization Development in Schools. University of Oregon, The Center for Educational Policy and Management, Mayfield Publishing Company, 1977. Please also see Hale, Norman. "Problem Solving Techniques for Administrators." ACSA School Management Digest, Series 1, Number 11, 1978. In ERIC ED 010 229. Please also see Massachusetts State Department of Education, "Force-field Analysis," 1976. In ERIC ED 153 190.)

TABLE 1

General Force Field Analysis Diagram

Current State of Affairs
(S)

Facilitating Forces	Restraining Forces
Most undesirable state is	Most desirable state is
at this side, i.e., the	at this side, i.e., the
evaluation plan is not	evaluation plan is developed
developed or if developed,	and implemented over the
is not implemented.	long run.

All this discussion about how predisposing factors could be used in a rough force-field analysis very early in evaluation system planning points out that this paper's retrospective look at probable predisposing factors is not a form of mental gymnastics but rather a relevant procedure that could increase would-be evaluators' level of efficiency. In addition, we would hope that at least some of the predisposing factors that produce restraining forces could surely be influenced by evaluation planners. This raises the prospect that planners could work successfully to overcome certain resisting influences and turn what looked like would become a stalled evaluation plan into one that would come to enjoy successful long-term implementation. In conclusion, this retrospective look at predisposing factors which may have facilitated the successful implementation of the handicap program's evaluation plan could help future evaluators: (1) become more efficient by helping them avoid wasting their valuable evaluation planning time, and (2) become more successful in plan implementation by helping them identify restraining forces that can be overcome. So, what is being offered in this paper has two important practical applications.

As factors are examined to see, by hindsight, if and how they may have facilitated the handicap evaluation plan implementation, the reader should ask himself, "How can I phrase this factor's influence so that I can assess its probable effect on my evaluation planning in the future?" In addition, the reader should ask, "If I were to use hindsight on one of my own evaluation planning attempts, would these factors apply?" That is, "Could that evaluation system's long term success or lack of it have been predicted by the use of this combination of five factors and a force-field analysis?"

Of course, what is being done here is analogous to noting that it rained today and asking ourselves "Could we have predicted yesterday that it would rain today?" For what is being said here is, "Given that this handicap program's evaluation system has been successful for a long time (eight years; 1977-85), is there a procedure we could have used early in our evaluation planning that would have predicted its long-term success?" By definition, a good forecasting procedure applied to the first situation would have predicted that it would rain today, for example. Also by definition, a good forecasting

procedure, in the second situation, would have predicted that the handicap program's evaluation plan would be successfully implemented over the long term. But does this make sense? Do the factors suggested earlier appear likely to have been facilitative? And, if so, how, exactly?

Factor 1: "The program's evaluation system was seen as 'invented here by us'—the 'major players'—that is, by the district-level administrator and each of the nine college-level coordinators."

The term, "Invented Here By Us," is actually a modification of the term, "Not Invented Here" used by Dr. Susan M. Markle of the University of Illinois in her journal article entitled, "Some Thoughts on Task Analysis and Objectives in Educational Psychology" (Markle, Susan, 1973). She used the term "Not Invented Here" as one explanation to describe the resistance by classroom teachers to using teaching materials that, in her opinion, were "...based on good task analysis...(and had) well stated objectives and valid criterion tests..." (Ibid). From her point of view, the provision of such materials should have reduced the job requirements for teachers to a "manageable level" (Ibid). Instead, their use was, in fact, resisted because they had not been invented by the classroom teachers themselves. She noted that many a teacher would "...rather do it himself, and badly, than accept another's approach, even if that approach had been fully validated (Ibid)."

Further support for this factor being important comes from a summary comment made by Paul Berman, senior research social scientist at Rand. After a four-year study of four major K-12 federal programs, he concluded that "The net return to federal investment was the adoption of many innovations, the successful implementation of few, and the long-run continuation of still fewer." Then he summarized by noting that "local decisions and choices on how to put the innovations into practice could spell the difference between success and failure..." (The California State Department of Education, "The State Reporter," 1978.) Although he did not use the term, "Invented Here By Us," this term seems to capture his point about "local decisions and choices on how

to put innovations into practice", for we argue here that in the process of deciding how, specifically, to put innovations into practice the major players would be building new educational program that, as they work together, more and more, becomes theirs.

But does the inclusion of this "Invented Here By Us" factor make sense if applied to the handicap evaluation system? The answer to this must be "Yes." It must be remembered who wrote this evaluation plan in the beginning--the district administrator and the nine campus coordinators. Further, it must also be remembered that all ten of these major players had to agree that each of the program objectives was acceptable before it actually became part of the management and evaluation comprehensive plan. The combination of the requirement for consensus by all ten major players, together with the very active involvement by them during the rewriting stage, meant that the evaluation plan really was "Invented Here By Us" and would be so perceived.

Part 2: Predisposing Factor #2

Factor 2: "There was an adequate level of trust between all the major players."

Support for the inclusion of the degree of trust as a factor that influences the course of program evaluation efforts is provided by Dr. Malcolm S. Weinstein in the article entitled, "The Role of Trust in Program Evaluation: Some Guidelines for the Perplexed Administrator" which appeared in the Canadian Psychologist (Weinstein, Malcolm, 1972). In that journal article, he wrote:

> This paper has argued that the major barrier to be overcome in implementing systems of program evaluation is not the lack of an adequate evaluation technology but rather the lack of an adequate foundation of trust. Studies in the area of experimental games, source credibility, and interpersonal trust have been reviewed in order to extract generalizations to serve as guidelines for developing trust...

> Fear and resistance to data collection for evaluation can assume almost phobic proportions. Clinically, the strategy proposed here reflects an approach similar to that used in systematic desensitization. It says that we should move, in a graded hierarchical way, from description to feedback to 'evaluation'.. After all is said and done, it appears to this writer that the best way to develop trust is to be trustworthy. (Ibid.)

Clearly, this trust factor and the first one, "Invented Here By Us," are closely related. If the major players perceive that "we" wrote the evaluation plan, then they will also perceive that "I had input" and therefore would be more likely to trust not only the plan itself but also the other personnel who were written into the plan including an outside evaluation consultant if there is one. While an estimate of the degree of trust among the nine campus coordinators and the district administrator is subjective, Dr. Kester, the one person situated outside this circle of program personnel, believes that a strong feeling of mutual trust was evident during the early development and implementation stages of the evaluation plan.

In addition to the "naturally" high level of trust that seemed to already exist among the program personnel, trust seemed to have been enhanced by two procedures that were deliberately conducted for the purpose of enhancing program objective attainment levels. For lack of a better term, these two practice procedures were categorized as being an "Evaluation/Audit Dress Rehearsal."

The first kind of practice session/dress rehearsal was held at Los Angeles Valley College when the other campus coordinators gathered around Mr. George Kopoulos, coordinator for Los Angeles Valley College's handicapped program and Mr. Jack Oliver, coordinator for East Los Angeles College's handicapped program. As the other seven coordinators watched, George and Jack responded, objective-by-objective, by producing all the "measures" called for in each of the 110 objectives in the district-wide management and evaluation plan. (Please see the current writers' first paper, ERIC No. ED 148 451 for a close look at how a few program objectives were written.) It was expected that George and Jack would do well when asked to respond to the documentation demands of each of the objectives so that in doing so they could act as models for how campus coordinators should respond. This did, in fact, occur as

expected and this first kind of practice session/dress rehearsal did provide important and accurate campus coordinator modeling behaviors.

The second kind of practice trial sessions/dress rehearsals occurred when Dr. Kester, the outside consultant, visited the campuses and asked each campus coordinator to respond to what was called for in each program objective. In that second practice session, as in the first, the person(s) asking for the campus coordinator's response would provide immediate feedback as to whether or not the coordinator's response was satisfactory on the first trial or not. If not, the reason was explained and suggestions were given as to what could be done to make it more satisfactory. In both forms of the dress rehearsal, the 'KISSS' approach was used--"Keep It Simple, Safe, and Supportive." The two dress rehearsals were simple since they were based only on the clear program objectives that the campus coordinators had not only helped write but also had unanimously accepted. Both practice sessions were "safe" and "supportive" in the sense that in both situations the campus coordinators had the opportunity to practice their responses without fear of failure. To use psychological terminology, the campus coordinators responses were "shaped" toward closer and closer approximations of what would be expected when the peer review evaluation team would arrive on their campus and ask for the documentation required in the evaluation plan.

Thanks to the fact that the coordinators had been active in writing and rewriting the management and evaluation plan in the first place, and had observed two good models respond correctly at Los Angeles Valley College, Dr. Kester found, during his on-site visit practice sessions, that only very minimal revisions of coordinator's responses were necessary to bring them into agreement with what was required by the evaluation plan.

Given this description of the two dress rehearsal practice sessions, one can see that systematic desensitization procedures were indeed used. (Professor Weinstein should be pleased.) But, how well did they work? A questionnaire was developed by turning the objectives of the dress rehearsals themselves into four statements. Then, the questionnaire was mailed to all nine campus coordinators who were asked to respond to each of the four statements by checking one of the following five response categories: "strongly disagree," "disagree," "no opinion," "agree," and "strongly agree." The respondents

returned the completed questionnaires to Dr. Kester who had them analyzed. Those encouraging results are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Results of the Non-Parametric Statistical Analysis of the Dress Rehearsals' Questionnaire Responses

Questionnaire Statement	Total n	Positive Response f	Significance Level	Response Mode
1. The Evaluation-Audit Dress Rehearsal familiarize me with the process, documentation, and due dates required in the evaluation and audit plan.	9	9	$p < .002$	"agree"
2. The Evaluation-Audit Dress Rehearsal helped me feel supported by the LACC district coordinator of the handicapped program in my efforts to attain program objectives.	9	8	$p < .02$	"strongly agree"
3. The Evaluation-Audit Dress Rehearsal helped me feel supported by the external consultant in my efforts to attain program objectives.	9	9	$p < .002$	"strongly agree"
4. The Evaluation-Audit Dress Rehearsal lowered by anxiety about the evaluation/audit process.	9	9	$p < .002$	"agree"

So, the level of trust that existed between the major players in this evaluation drama seems, upon review of the questionnaire data analysis, to have been high. The outside consultant, early on, noticed a "naturally" high level. Further, the two practice sessions referred to as "dress rehearsals" seem, on the basis of questionnaire responses, to have: familiarized the campus coordinators with their exact responsibilities as required by the evaluation plan, helped them feel very supported by the district coordinator and outside consultant, and reduced the campus coordinator's anxiety. Thus, the desensitizing dress rehearsals can be said to have likely increased the level of trust between the major players. At the very least, a perception of strong support by the district coordinator and outside consultant should bring an increase in trust. In conclusion, the factor of the degree of trust (our factor 2) can be said to have "worked" in this real life example in that it appears to have existed at such a level that it more than likely predisposed the handicap evaluation system to long-run success.

Part 3: Predisposing Factor #3

Factor 3: **"Three organizational factors supported the implementation of this program's evaluation system and thereby predisposed the system to long-term success."**

The evidence for including "level of special funding," "span of supervision," and "line authority" as predisposing organizational variables is comparative in nature. The evidence arises from the comparison of the different levels of success of the evaluation systems of three student service programs within the Los Angeles Community College district as well as a comparison of their different forms of organization. The handicap evaluation system was used as a model in developing the two other evaluation plans--one for the campus child development program and one for the counseling program--so the three plans were quite similar in a number of respects. The evaluation plans for the handicap and child development programs were implemented while the evaluation plan for counseling was not. Since implementation of a

program's evaluation plan is a necessary step in the long-run success of that program's evaluation system, it must be said that the handicap evaluation system and the campus child development system were much more successful than the counseling evaluation system. The handicap evaluation system has produced numerous evaluation reports beginning with the first one; i.e., the one for 1977-79. The child development evaluation system has produced two evaluation reports, one for 1981-82 and one for 1983-84. By contrast, since an evaluation report describes the level of attainment of program objectives, and the counseling evaluation plan was never implemented, it has been impossible to produce even one counseling program evaluation report. An evaluation plan must be implemented before it can be used as a basis for doing an evaluation.

Fortunately for our comparative purposes here, not only do these three program evaluation systems differ in their long-term success levels but they also differ on the three organizational variables already mentioned; namely, on their "levels of special funding," "span of supervision," and amount of "line authority" enjoyed by key personnel. These are, of course, organizational variables. (Kossen, Stan, 1978) One could say, of course, that the differences mentioned are purely coincidental, but there is compelling logic to the assertion, made here, that these organizational differences did influence the long-term success levels of the three program evaluation systems.

But how did the three programs differ on the three organizational variables? To answer this we must look carefully at all three programs. We will see that the program with the least successful evaluation system (counseling) is different from the other two programs (Handicap and Child development) in at least three ways in which it was and is now organized.

"Level of special funding" is one organizational variable that distinguishes the district's counseling program from the same district's handicap program and its child development program. Both the handicap and child development programs receive special funding, i.e., they are funded through separate funding corridors at the state level. In contrast, for counseling, something like block funding based on the college's enrolled students' average daily attendance flows to colleges first, then is divided into salaries for administrators, instructors, and counselors. Even the number

of counselors a college has is a local college decision. Although this is an oversimplified description of the funding, it is true that handicap program money and child development center money are much more separate, and that, in effect, there is no separate counseling money--to the same degree at least. (This may change, however. A state-level task force is now looking into the feasibility of establishing differential/separate funding for counseling and other non-instructional activities.) With the allocation of separate monies usually comes a requirement for fiscal and educational program accountability. Annual fiscal accounting is required and annual evaluation reporting is either required or strongly encouraged. This kind of environmental pressure is very much felt by the handicap and child development programs but does not really exist in the same way for the counseling program.

"Span of supervision" is a second organizational variable that distinguishes the district's counseling program. Both of the evaluation plans for the two other programs (handicap and child development) were written by the nine program administrators from each college who faced substantially fewer employees than the nine counseling chairs did when they returned to their colleges and attempted to sell the idea of using the new evaluation system. A college director of a child development center faced a secretary and several teachers. A college coordinator of a handicap program faced a secretary and several office workers including, possibly, a handicap counselor or two plus a number of student workers, such as: note-takers, mobility assistants, and so on. In contrast, counseling chairs encountered more people when they got "home" to their campuses. We can logically suspect that it would take more persuasive ability to convince twenty other counselors at a campus than it would take to convince fewer people. Furthermore, since all counselors were certificated/credentialed employees, the counseling chairs who carried the counseling evaluation plan back to their campuses faced more certificated people than did the handicap or child development directors. In addition, there were many more people in the "counselor" category in the entire district. Approximately 130 counselors in the district were eventually to be involved in that program's evaluation. This total number was several times as great as the comparable number for the handicap program and the child development program. Thus the organizational variable of "span of supervision" was different for the counseling program--both at the campus level and the aggregated district level.

In addition, counseling chairs faced colleagues--not subordinates. So a third characteristic, "line authority", was lacking in the counseling program situation but was in existence for both the handicap and child development program situations. Given a child development center director's "line authority", he or she could more nearly tell the secretary and the teachers that this will be our evaluation system. A counseling chair did not hold such line or supervisory authority and could say only something like: "Here is what we nine counseling chairs have developed. What do you think we should do with it at our campus?" It is not surprising that the counselors' responses ranged widely. Most often the responses took the form of simple neglect of the evaluation plan, but it is not surprising that some counselors' actions and comments were directly negative. It may be, too, that because the counselors were certificated colleagues, they were generally more critical and less compliant in their attitudes.

In summary, there were three organizational differences that predisposed the handicap program's evaluation system toward long-run success. First, the handicap program's "special funding" brought with it formal requirements for on-going fiscal and educational accountability. Second, the handicap program enjoyed a campus and district level "span of control" that was manageable. And finally, the nine campus coordinators of the handicap program held "line authority."

Part 4: Predisposing Factor #4

Factor 4: The different forms of "resistance to innovation" were overcome.

Support for the inclusion of factor 4--overcoming resistance to innovation--and factor 5--taking advantage of a readiness for innovation--as factors that predisposed the handicap evaluation system to long-term success is derived from a document by Bell, Wyant and Schmuck entitled, "Diagnosing a School's Readiness for Change: What to Look for When Starting an Innovation,"

(Bell, Wyant and Schmuck, 1979). Of course, these three coauthors were writing about all kinds of program innovations, whereas the tactic put forward here is to use their ideas and also consider the introduction and continuation of the handicap evaluation system as one kind of successful innovation. This appears warranted since the introduction and continuation of this evaluation system did cause substantial change and, therefore, was an innovation. If this evaluation system's creation and long-term implementation is one kind of innovation, then what Bell, et al., had to say about the factors which impede or enhance innovation would apply to this evaluation system.

In their small monograph, Bell, et al. (1979) stated that their ideas were based on earlier publications by: The League of Cooperating Schools, 1974-75; the National Diffusion Network, 1977; Rand, 1977; The Program on Strategies of Organizational Change, 1970-1979, and a review of the literature by Runkel and Schmuck, 1979. They noted that while most of what they postulated was empirically based, they also described conditions drawn from their experience in working with schools (Ibid).

Since the handicap evaluation system did alter the program and the way personnel interacted with each other, Bell's definition of change is appropriate to our special case of innovation. They wrote:

> ...Change occurs in schools when people alter programs, materials, and the way they interact with each other. Change is difficult to initiate and maintain because the interactions among people have already, in most instances, become stable routines that are dependable and more or less satisfying. Change disrupts this stability; it brings uncertainty and at least a temporary loss of the rewards and routines that people have come to count on. Change is nearly always costly and painful, and too often it falls short of reaching its goal...(Ibid., p. 1.)

After introducing their opinion that resistance to change is to be expected, since change is a form of disruption, they listed nine reasons why such resistance is encountered: 1) fear of failure or evaluation; 2) cost-benefit calculation; 3) perceptions of impact on politics of school; 4) low interdependence; 5) strong norms of autonomy; 6) weak norms of collaboration; 7) lack of specific goals, few shared goals; 8) lack of energy

and resources, and 9) lack of rewards (Ibid., p. 11.) Thus, what we are calling predisposing factor #4, "The different forms of 'Resistance to Innovation' were overcome", was broken down into nine different forms of resistance by the coauthors of the monograph.

According to our hypothesis, these nine forms of resistance to change or innovation were overcome by the progress of the handicap evaluation system (factor 4). But, in retrospect, does this make sense? Is it possible, through hindsight, to explain how these forms of resistance were overcome?

According to the monograph, the first form of resistance arises from a "fear of failure" or "fear of (personal) evaluation." Bell and his coauthors wrote:

> Many individuals have a fear of failure or being negatively evaluated. It is uncomfortable to expose one's self to colleagues while trying to master new routines, or to be closely watched by change advocates, helpers, and others anxiously monitoring the change to see if it succeeds. There is little reason for teachers to put themselves through that exposure, or to risk that failure, if they do not believe that the effort will produce good results. (Ibid., p. 9.)

While Bell and his coauthors focused on innovations at the K-12 level, it is felt that the principles they identified (factors 4 and 5) are applicable to the program and personnel who designed and implemented the handicap evaluation system in the Los Angeles community college district. Certainly, all nine campus coordinators knew that the change advocate, Victoria Richart, and the helper, Dr. Don Kester, would be monitoring the change to see if it succeeded. In fact, those who would be monitoring also included peers of the campus coordinators too, since, according to the evaluation plan, each college's visiting evaluation team included the district administrator, the outside consultant and campus coordinators of the handicap program from the district's other colleges.

It is felt that the progress of the handicap evaluation system did overcome the expected fear of failure on the part of campus coordinators. As already mentioned, the outside consultant perceived a high level of trust among

the program personnel. Additionally, all nine campus coordinators went through two dress rehearsals the purpose of which was to increase the attainment levels on program objectives. As already mentioned, according to questionnaires returned to the outside consultant by the campus coordinators, those dress rehearsals familiarized the coordinators with their exact responsibilities ($p.<002$), helped them feel supported by both the district director ($p.< 02$), and the outside consultant ($p.<002$), and reduced their anxiety ($p.<002$). (Please see Table 2 as previously presented). Since those two practice sessions included opportunities for the campus coordinators to practice their responses--without fear of failure—the natural resistance to change, based on fear of failure, was likely overcome.

The second form of resistance was said to arise out of a kind of cost-benefit calculation that program personnel make. Bell and his colleagues wrote:

> ...When confronted with a proposed change, most people perform a sort of mental calculus that compares costs with benefits. They make an estimate (often not consciously) of the change's probability of succeeding, how much improvement it will make, and how much energy will be required to implement it. People are understandably reluctant to take on changes with a low apparent probability of success, those that will seemingly make little difference, and those which require large amounts of energy to implement. ...(Ibid.)

In comparing costs with benefits, the district administrator and nine campus coordinators decided that the benefits of developing and implementing the handicap evaluation system outweighed the costs. This assertion rings true since, at the outset, the district administrator made it clear that creating and putting the system into place would go a long way toward making sure that the program would stand up well under any future audit by outside authorities. Such a future audit seemed likely since the source of funding for this program was external to the district and the total cost of the program at the district level was the greatest charged to any single community college district in the state. (The Los Angeles community college district has the greatest student enrollment, and hence the greatest handicap student enrollment among all community college districts in the state.) The naturally large expenditure amount for handicapped students plus external funding appeared likely to

combine to make it very probable that the program would be audited closely by outside fiscally oriented agencies.

And, in fact, the state authorities were and are seen as doing detailed fiscal audits. In the Los Angeles Times, a recent headline read: "College must pay $437,000 to State." (Los Angeles Times, Sunday, November 19, 1984, S Part IX, pages 1 and 2). The article quoted the chancellor of the state's community college system as having written that the financial demand made of the Mt. San Antonio Community College District was made after an investigation that was "...triggered two years ago by a routine audit of San Antonio College's attendance records." (Ibid.)

In addition to the generally expected benefit of having input into the evaluation system for their program, members of the handicap evaluation plan writing team came to expect that if they were able to make the proposed evaluation system a reality, that would naturally lead to enhanced status for their program, both as viewed by personnel at the district and other personnel at their own campus. Is this important?

The third form of resistance to innovation that Bell, et al., identified is that which is due to perceptions of impact on politics of the school. They wrote:

> All but the most trivial changes will have some impact on the status, prestige, and access to resources of school personnel. Often a group trying an innovation is seen as the "in crowd" having the principal's favor; or teachers trying a new reading program have new materials and help from specialists that others lack. People are going to resent and resist changes that seem to lower their own standing and raise others. (Bell, Wyant, and Schmuck, 1979, p. 10)

One might expect that the converse would also be true; namely, that people would not resent nor resist those changes that seem to raise their own standing within the political environment. As mentioned, enhanced status came to be expected. Therefore, the converse should have applied; i.e., handicap program evaluation planning personnel would not resent or resist the changes.

The fourth through the seventh forms of resistance listed by Bell, et.al., are: 4. Low interdependence, 5. Strong norms of autonomy, 6. Weak norms of collaboration, and 7. Lack of specific goals, few shared goals. (Ibid.)

They wrote further:

> Teaching is largely an individual endeavor. School members usually place a high value on autonomy, and norms supporting collaborative efforts are usually weak or nonexistent. Because teachers receive their main rewards from classroom interactions and because they feel unison in schoolwide matters it is usually difficult to generate enthusiasm for changes... (Ibid.)

It is argued here that the fourth through the seventh forms of resistance did not develop to deter the handicap evaluation system's progress. Three reasons come to mind as to why these forms resistance did not emerge. First, innovation was largely at the district and campus coordinator levels as opposed to at the classroom level; the level focused on by Bell, et. al., as described in the quote above. Second, the coordinators had a long history of working cooperatively with each other. When Dr. Kester began assisting Mrs. Richart, a number of coordinators informally volunteered their view that as a group they had a long history of cooperating to a much greater degree than their campus colleagues who directed other student service programs that were in operation at all nine colleges Finally, the way the evaluation plan itself was developed meant that it was written and rewritten at a time when the district and campus administrators worked together, and so they, themselves, were the ones who actually wrote the final version of the program's goals and objectives. Thus, the fourth through the seventh forms of resistance probably did not act to impede the Handicap Evaluation System. School teachers may have few specific shared goals with other teachers, but the nine handicap program coordinators themselves developed and agreed to 110 specific program objectives. (The evaluation plan showing all of these objectives will be submitted to ERIC for possible inclusion in their clearinghouse data base.)

The eighth form of resistance identified by Bell is due to a lack of "energy and resources." Bell and his coauthors wrote:

> Also schools generally do not have energy and resources that can easily be diverted from day-to-day tasks. Making changes requires some "extra" resources that are not already committed to routine operations, and schools often do not have this flexibility. Most of a district's budget goes to salaries and benefits, so there are few resources that can be treated as "risk capital" for purposes of innovation. Moreover, most people in schools--especially teachers--have rigid time schedules that allow little discretionary time that might be used for planning and implementing change. (Ibid.)

Fortunately for the prospects of the handicap evaluation system, the campus coordinators were not tied down to having to be in front of a class teaching. Each had his or her own office and office staff and some control over his or her schedule. Consequently, the district administrator could set her agenda for monthly or even more frequent meetings with the campus coordinators and expect to convene well-attended meetings. During those meetings, the district administrator could direct energy and resources toward developing and implementing the handicap evaluation system. In addition, she could do this not just in the short term but every year and over several years. In fact, to date, she has done this for eight years (1977-1985).

Finally, Bell, et. al., identified their last or ninth form of resistance as "lack of rewards." They wrote:

> Finally, schools rarely have reward systems that encourage change and innovation. Teachers who spend a lot of their time in the extra effort to implement an innovation receive the same salary as teachers who simply put in their time in the classroom. Administrators who devote attention to a new project get no relief from the routine load of paperwork and reports. There are no "Christmas bonuses" of time or money to reward success and extra effort. These conditions can be overcome, we think, but only with considerable skill and patience on the part of the helper and school members. (Ibid.)

Early in the development of the evaluation system plans were made to formally congratulate those who, during the implementation stage, would have done a good job; program successes were to be celebrated at the campus and district levels not only by way of the published evaluation reports but in other ways as well. Superior work was to bring specific commendations from the district administrator and the peer review team. Results from the on-site team visits were also to be shared with individual campus presidents and the

appropriate deans and assistant deans. In addition, it was hoped that the results would be presented at conferences and made available through the ERIC system. All this relates to what was said regarding the third form of resistance which dealt with the politics of the school. The view was that the evaluation system would, after it was implemented, result in the enhancement of the status of the program at the district and at the college levels.

This completes the rear-view mirror look at each of the nine forms of resistance to innovation described by Bell, Wyant and Schmuck. It is conceded that this backward look at these forms of resistance is informed or, one might even say, contaminated by knowledge that the handicap evaluation was successful over the long run and so the view is not, of course, as uncertain as a forecast of a developing evaluation system's future would be. However, the ease with which this post-hoc analysis has resulted in positive assessments on each of these forms of resistance as well as on the first three predisposing factors already discussed, suggests that a good forecast method--possibly the force-field analysis method combined with the five predisposing factors offered here--could have correctly estimated that the handicap evaluation system would be highly successful over the long run.

So far we have taken a backward look at the first four factors that the coauthors of this paper assert probably predisposed this particular evaluation system toward long run success. So far we have considered the four factors of:

1) The system was perceived as "invented here" by the major actors,

2) There was an adequate level of trust,

3) Three organizational factors were supportive of the effort, and

4) The nine different forms of "resistance to innovation" were overcome.

Only one more probable predisposing factor remains to be examined. Our last factor is factor 5.

Part 5: Predisposing Factor #5

Factor 5: "There was a 'readiness for innovation'."

The monograph, "Diagnosing a School's Readiness for Change," is again the source document for the inclusion of a "readiness for innovation" as a major factor that probably predisposed the system toward success. Although we here are calling this one factor, Bell and his coauthors listed 27 "conditions for readiness" for change under six cluster headings. Those six clusters are shown below in Table 3.

TABLE 3

The Six Conditions-for-Readiness Clusters

CLUSTER NUMBER	CLUSTER TITLE
Cluster 1	Accessibility of Resources and Support
Cluster 2	Internal Press for Change
Cluster 3	Stability of the Staff Undergoing Change
Cluster 4	Skill in Collaborative Group Work
Cluster 5	Norms Supporting Collaborative Group Work
Cluster 6	Spirit of Risk-Taking

Again, while the relative strength of each of the 27 conditions for readiness for change cannot be known as of the early stages of the development of the handicap evaluation system, some rough approximations of the strength of some of them can now be made. These guesstimates, together with a rough kind of force-field analysis clearly show that the attempt to develop and implement the system was likely to succeed.

Of course, the use of the 27 conditions for readiness for change in combination with a force-field analysis could be done initially as one tries to install an innovation and then again, repeatedly, as one proceeds, or fails to make progress in the installation of a program evaluation system, as the case may be. For now, let's look at selected conditions within each cluster to see what hindsight suggests. According to the monograph, the first cluster is made up of the following five conditions for readiness. These are shown below in Display 1.

DISPLAY 1

Conditions of Readiness for Change

Breakdown of Cluster 1

Cluster 1: Accessibility of Resources and Support

1.1 Extent and kind of technical knowledge needed to implement change

1.2 Availability of technical knowledge within the school

1.3 Accessibility of technical knowledge and expertise outside the school

1.4 Availability of financial resources

1.5 Support from key administrators in the district

Does a backward look at the handicap evaluation system and the conditions in cluster 1 result in the conclusion that the system enjoyed access to the needed resources and support as identified in cluster 1? Yes, it does. Let us take the last condition (condition 1.5) first. The key administrator in the district was Victoria Richart. She was the one at the district level who would

implement the Evaluation Plan once it had been developed, and, she was its biggest supporter. Fortunately, and not incidentally, the district administrator who was to implement the plan was the same one who not only initiated its development but also became heavily involved in its development. And, as mentioned in the acknowledgments section, Victoria did not stand alone in her drive toward program accountability. She was backed up by not only her vice-chancellor, first Dr. McCuen then Dr. Washington, but also by her chancellor, Dr. Koltai and the Board.

Were financial resources available (condition 1.4)? Again, yes. As mentioned in the title of this paper, the annual operating cost of this program would range between $1.0 and $2.0 million. Fortunately again, some of that very sizable amount was under the district administrator's discretionary control. Outside the district there was technical knowledge and expertise (condition 1.3). Dr. Ray Pitts, from the chancellor's office, shared his expertise in the management an evaluation of this developing system. In addition, Dr. Donald Kester advised on the techniques of setting up an evaluation system. Technical knowledge was resident within the district too (condition 1.1). Victoria Richart had taken time to carefully examine the relevant laws, rules, and regulations. Moreover, she and the campus coordinators knew a great deal about what the to-be-written evaluation plan should contain; they had a clear idea of what the goals and objectives should be. It appears that an imaginary force-field analysis, that sought to apply these five conditions to the handicap evaluation system early in its development, would have produced the conclusion that the environmental press from all five of the cluster 1 conditions was in the direction of successful installation of the innovation; i.e., The Handicap Evaluation System.

DISPLAY 2

Conditions of Readiness for Change

Breakdown of Cluster 2

Cluster 2: Internal Press for Change

2.1 Proportion of individuals dissatisfied with the present situation

2.2 Proportion of individuals valuing the proposed target

2.3 Proportion of individuals who have confidence that the proposed change will bring benefits

---

The current writers believe that at the beginning of the development of the handicap evaluation system the majority of program personnel probably were not dissatisfied with the then present situation. We believe, as stated in the monograph, that "...change means abandoning the old ways of interacting and establishing new ones (and this is a) step that is taken only with reluctance. ...(moreover) change is difficult to initiate and maintain because the interaction among people have already, in most instances, become stable routines that are dependable and more or less satisfying. (Ibid, pp. 4 and i.) If this assessment of the general absence of dissatisfaction is correct, the press from condition 2.1 ("dissatisfactions") would have been mostly against change--with one exception. The district administrator, who was comparatively new to her position, wanted to change. And since she was relatively new, interactions between her and the nine campus coordinators may not yet have hardened into "stable routines" that would be extremely difficult to change.

What was said earlier in regard to the "cost-benefit" form of resistance and the "impact on the school's politics" form of resistance is relevant to the next two conditions within cluster 2 (Conditions 2.2 and 2.3). Condition 2.2 calls attention to the proportion of program personnel who value the to-be-completed evaluation system, while condition 2.3 calls attention to the proportion of program personnel who are confident that the system will bring benefits. We said earlier that program personnel probably performed a mental calculation in which they compared the system's expected costs and benefits and

decided that working to develop and implement it would be worth what it would cost. In addition, we believe that they perceived that it was likely that their financially costly district program (in comparison to other California community college districts) would be in for a carefully done audit by an outside agency. And, we believe that they perceived that if the ambitious system could be made to operate as planned, their program's status would surely be enhanced. Thus, the press of cluster 2 would likely be in the direction of a forecast of successful Handicap Evaluation system development and implementation. Logic suggests that program personnel would have valued the to-be-completed evaluation system and would have been confident that it would bring benefits.

DISPLAY 3

Conditions of Readiness for Change

Breakdown of Cluster 3

Cluster 3: Stability of the Staff Undergoing Change

3.1 Proportion of turnover of membership of the staff

3.2 Commitment of key administrators to remaining in current positions for duration of the change

3.3 Proportion of individuals attempting other changes

3.4 Proportion of the staff experiencing stress due to the complexity of the school organization

---

In regard to condition 3.3, proportion of individuals attempting other changes, an into-the-past glance suggests that this proportion would have been low. All ten program managers worked full time in the handicap program; the district administrator was full time and each of the nine campus-level managers was too. In addition, secretaries, handicap counselors, and other members of

the campus coordinators' staffs were also full time. Professionally, there should have been very little change impacting these people except for the dramatic work to create and install the newly developing Handicap Evaluation System.

In addition, since most personnel just mentioned had been working in their handicap program positions for a number of years when work on the system began, we might guess that few of them would be experiencing "stress due to the complexity of the school organization" (condition 3.4) simply because the handicap "organization" was extremely familiar. It is true that the financial condition of the district and each college would turn grim, but that did not begin to be felt until the 1980's. As mentioned, the initial development of this evaluation system took place in 1977 and 1978.

"Turnover" of membership of the staff (condition 3.1) and "commitment of key administrators to remaining in their current positions for the duration of the change" (condition 3.2) must be seen as real sources of strength. Put simply, people tended to stay because their personalities fit the helping jobs they had. George Kopoulos, long time handicap coordinator at Los Angeles Valley College, described the relevant feelings of the ten key administrators by saying that we tend to be "humanitarian" in our outlook; and "feel empathy" for the handicapped people we are employed to assist. George also said that from the beginning of the district's handicap program," we have had a 'real cohesiveness'as a group; we have always had a 'cooperative spirit;' and shared 'ideas, time, and money.'" George should know; he started working at Valley in 1970 and became full time handicap coordinator in 1972-73. Jack Oliver, now handicap coordinator at Mission, said, "we stay in our positions because we simply 'enjoy our work.'"

It sounds almost trite to say that it takes "a certain kind of person" to be any kind of "helper" and an even "more special" kind of person to help the handicapped. One of the writers of this paper, Dr. Kester, was confined to a wheel chair for a year and so knows first hand what being handicapped is like. He reports that in going from not being handicapped to being handicapped and

them back again one must be struck by the change in attitude and behavior of those around you. When you are handicapped, he notes, you are forced to realize that it is hard to find someone who will go to the trouble to really be of help. Dr. Kester found that most people on walking toward somebody who is wheelchair bound will look away or stare, and almost everyone seems to feel uncomfortable and at a loss to know what to do. It was rare, he said, to find anyone who knew how or would take the time to help you help yourself. Cliche' as it sounds, Dr. Kester is certain that one of the lessons he learned from being handicapped was that one does indeed need to be unusual in a very positive sense to choose to assist the handicapped. What characterizes the handicap program managers and staff is this humanitarian, empathic approach. Although it may sound like a platitude, it seems that there is a "good fit" between the demands of the job and the personalities of the "special kind" of people who coordinate programs and services for the handicapped.

Probably because of this good fit most handicap program coordinators and staff really enjoy their jobs and don't want to leave the field. Jack Oliver is a good example. When he was asked to become Dean at Mission and leave the handicap program he said "no" to the administration. George Kopoulos of Valley reported that he "fought them off for years" before making a move out of the handicap program. One simply sees very little change in the handicap staff and key administrators even when the view encompasses many years. Even at Valley, George stayed from 1970 to 1982! And as one of the prime movers toward the evaluation system in 1977, George certainly stayed in his campus coordinator position for more than the "duration of the change" (condition 3.2).

Only three more changes, again over the long term, are worth mention. Those involve Mission College, Pierce College, and Trade Tech College. All of those were marked by very orderly transitions. At Mission, Sally Smith took over the handicap coordinator duties in 1978-79, when Jack Kearney retired. But Sally was not new, she had been the Handicap Learning Disabilities instructor at Mission. When she left Mission she went to Valley College then on to Harbor College, teaching learning disabilities at both. When Sally left Mission, Jack Oliver moved into that coordinator's position from his coordinator's position at East. Joe Najar, previously a handicap counselor for five years at East, became coordinator at East.

Another smooth transition took place at Los Angeles Trade Tech. In 1983 when Ronnie Fisher retired from the handicap coordinator position, Delores Powell stepped in to assume those duties. Again Delores was not new to the college as she had been a counselor at Trade Tech for a number of years. Additional strength that added to the ease of the transition came from the fact that the campus staff at Trade remained very stable. The instructor/advisor for the deaf and hearing impaired has been working in the handicap program since it began in 1969. Furthermore, the person who just became the handicap specialist (a new position title) has been working in the program for six years.

When Jim Lagerstrom left the handicap coordinator's position at Los Angeles Pierce to go back into teaching, Norm Crozer assumed the duties of that office. Again Norm was not new to the handicap services field or to the college; he had been a special education instructor at Pierce for eight years. The other campus coordinators have remained the same since 1977. Burt Amos is still handicap coordinator at West, Henryette Fisher still at Southwest, Steve Harshfield still at Harbor, and Chad Woo still at City. Furthermore, Victoria Richart has stayed as district administrator for the entire 1977-1985 period.

In addition, there are a great many examples of longevity among campus staff. Jack Oliver's current secretary has been secretary to the handicap coordinator since 1978. The secretary at East has done that job since 1975. The handicap counselor at Southwest has been there since 1977. Both secretaries in the handicap office at Pierce have been there for ten years. The three interpreters had been there since 1974, 1976 and 1977 respectfully. So again the office staff was stable over the period of the change to the new handicap evaluation system created in 1977.

Almost ironically, the greatest turnover took place at Valley College after George left. Jim Micko preceded Betsy Hornung who preceded the current Bob Scott as campus coordinator. As mentioned before, however, these changes came after George left and must be seen as recent; i.e., not occurring "during

the change (to the evaluation system)" but rather years later. George purposely and successfully "fought them off" to remain as handicap coordinator and to help develop and implement the handicap evaluation system.

In conclusion, one must be impressed by the enduring character of the membership among the managers and the staff. The handicap program team was generally blessed with continuity and usually easy transitioning. Turnover was minimal when you consider the time involved (1977-85) and the supposedly "attractive alternatives" in upward mobility. The stability of staff who designed and implemented the innovation was clearly a major source of strength. The committment of the ten key administrators must be described as exceptional.

DISPLAY 4

Conditions of Readiness for Change

Breakdown of Cluster 4

Cluster 4: Skill in Collaborative Group Work

4.1 Group skill in communicating accurately

4.2 Group skill in making clear decisions

4.3 Group skill in conducting effective meetings

4.4 Group skill in working effectively with diverse views, opinions, and values

4.5 Group skill in solving problems

All five of the above described group skills were clearly evident as early as the end of the first four months of development when the marathon Evaluation Plan writing team met the first time. These group skills were also evident in similar meetings of the whole evaluation plan writing team when they met to further flesh out the plan. Such a meeting was held a few months after the Valley meeting to create or revise the required data gathering forms. Further, the district administrator made it a point to schedule a full day at

the end of every year for the whole group to attend to the task of revising the goals and objectives within the Evaluation Plan. As the years went by, less and less time was needed to make those revisions, as program personnel came to be satisfied with them as previously written, accepted, and implemented. The point is that all of the collaborative group skills listed above were demonstrated clearly at a very early stage in the system's development and continued to be evident as time passed.

The fact that this evidence was available early is most encouraging, since it suggests that an attempt to forecast the likely degree of success of the attempt to install the system would not only have been possible early, but also would have led to a correct estimate of the system's successful future.

DISPLAY 5

Conditions of Readiness for Change

Breakdown of Cluster 5

Cluster 5: Norms Supporting Collaborative Group Work

5.1 Norms supporting collaboration

5.2 Norms supporting continued communication in emotional situations

5.3 Norms supporting perseverance in group tasks

5.4 Norms supporting individual disclosure of feelings, worries, or frustrations with the task

5.5 Norms supporting third-party helping

As regards cluster 5, the authors of the monograph say that by "norms" they mean "...shared expectations that a particular set of behaviors will be approved or disapproved within a particular context." (Bell, Wyant and Schmuck, 1979, p.18.) They explain what they mean by the first condition in this cluster, condition 5.1, "norms supporting collaboration," by saying that, "By this condition we mean there is a shared expectation that it is appropriate for members to work together on common task (Ibid)." This kind of collaborative working together is exactly what began to take place in the

thought-focusing meeting with Dr. Ray Pitts from the state chancellor's office, and continued in the marathon evaluation plan rewriting meeting that followed. As mentioned, all ten of the major program personnel were heavily involved in the marathon Evaluation Plan rewriting. The entire group continued to work together after that until the committee of the whole had reached consensus on all 110 objectives. And it continued further working together until consensus was reached on the data gathering forms and the filing system that would be used. It would be difficult to imagine a group being more collaborative than this (condition 5.1). And, the group certainly showed that they had norms that supported perseverance in group tasks (condition 5.3). Members of the group were willing to stick with the task and see it through to completion. Agreeing on 110 objectives was no small task. Also, many were willing to attend extra meetings and give up some of their own time to get the work done. For, as mentioned, special plan writing sessions were held and, in addition, several people volunteered to work with the district coordinator to develop data gathering instruments.

Condition 5.2 speaks of "continued communication in emotional situations" and is obviously related to condition 5.4, which speaks of "individual disclosure of feelings, worries, and frustrations with the task" (Ibid., p.19). As mentioned earlier, the campus coordinators were quick to point out weaknesses they saw in the original draft of the evaluation plan as written by the district coordinator. Emotional tones, feelings, and frustrations were very much a part of that initial marathon meeting. As is often the case, program personnel found that it was easier to criticize than offer a better stated objective. Campus coordinators saw that their criticisms were received by the district administrator and shared by her with the total writing team. And one could "see" the wheels turning in the campus coordinators minds when Mrs. Richart asked, "How do you think that objective should be rewritten?" More often than not, the ones who had criticized and then, after reflection, had offered their revision, themselves heard criticisms of their version from others. In this way, they came to realize that writing clear program objectives that would be acceptable to all ten program managers was no easy task. And yet the group did proceed to constructively accept and work through those ideas and their attendant feelings.

It could of course have turned out differently. Often groups work fine until emotions reach a certain level, then group work grinds to a halt. in regard to condition 5.2, communication in "emotional situations," the monograph authors wrote:

> We believe that expressions of feelings are valuable sources of information because people's responses to the task are emotional as well as cognitive. The group that recognizes expressions of feelings as legitimate is more likely to have members that understand and support decisions and actions. Greater task effectiveness and individual satisfaction result from a full sharing of both emotional and cognitive responses to the task at hand. (Ibid., p.18.)

Fortunately for the development of the handicap evaluation system, open expression of feelings was allowed and needed compromises were reached. This is not to say that this was easy to do because it wasn't. The fact that it happened this way is a tribute to the ten who made it happen.

The last condition included in this cluster is "norms supporting third-party helping" (condition 5.5). The authors define this as meaning that the group views it as appropriate for a third group member to help two or more group members by clarifying communications and resolving differences between them, as well as helping them to see the other person's point of view. In their monograph they noted their belief that "...a major part of the helper's task is to establish an open and trusting relationship..." (Ibid., p. 3.) But the writers of this paper wish to put forth their belief that it would not have been enough if only the outside helper, in this case, Dr. Kester, has done this. If he had been the only one who tried to clarify communications and resolve differences, we believe, the attempt to build an effective evaluation system would have failed. Fortunately, the district administrator was good at doing this, and many of the campus coordinators were too. In fact, third party helping was a pervasive role, assumed by first one person, then another, then another, etc.

It should be noted that one could detect early that the press of this cluster was toward successful development and implementation of the Handicap Evaluation system. Like the press of clusters considered earlier in this paper, the positive press of cluster 5 was evident within the first six months

of evaluation plan development. Again, this early detection capability bodes well for the use of the force-field analysis together with predisposing factors as a forecasting method.

The last cluster of conditions of readiness for change has to do with risk-taking.

DISPLAY 6

Conditions of Readiness for Change

Breakdown of Cluster 6

Cluster 6: Spirit of Risk-Taking

6.1 Proportion of individuals who are willing to risk new action on behalf of the school

6.2 Willingness of key administrators to make reciprocal changes in their behavior

6.3 Presence of charismatic leadership

6.4 Proportion of individuals willing to undergo training in new skills and behavior

6.5 Proportion of individuals experiencing stress, anxiety, or threat, regardless of the source.

While it would be difficult if not impossible now to accurately estimate the proportion of individuals who were experiencing stress, anxiety, or threat (condition 6.5) as of so many years ago, or to read the minds of the participants to know to what degree they thought charismatic leadership existed (condition 6.3), it is nevertheless possible now to make some informed estimates on the other three conditions listed within this cluster (conditions 6.1, 6.2, and 6.4).

In regard to the first condition (condition 6.1) that refers to the proportion of personnel who are willing to risk "new action," one would have to say that 100% of the ten program managers were willing to do something

new--that is, to come together, write new goals and objectives, set up on-site visitation schedules for the peer review teams, and build an evaluation results reporting schedule. Because it is impossible to attain more than 100%, (ten of ten), one would have to say that this evaluation system attained the highest possible level on this "willingness to risk something new" condition (condition 6.1). The same can be said in regard to condition 6.2. One would again have to say that all ten key administrators (100%) were willing to make reciprocal changes in their behaviors as reflected in their willingness to rewrite the "target" or "person(s) responsible" section of the program's objectives.

The authors of the monograph explain their inclusion of reciprocity as a readiness condition (condition 6.2) by identifying the message that is sent if key administrators are not willing to do so. They say that that message is the same as saying, "You go ahead and change, but don't ask me to do so." Chronologically, it was Mrs. Richart who first demonstrated her willingness to make such changes in her behavior. As objectives were initially being offered to replace ones being debated in that marathon rewriting meeting at Los Angeles Valley College, she was accepting of suggestions that changed the "Who is responsible" part of the objective. In fact, then and at later meetings held to revise the evaluation plan, she showed that on many objectives she was willing to accept the task responsibility herself, i.e., she was willing to be the one designated as responsible for completing the task. Her willingness to make such changes in her behavior encouraged others to respond in a similar fashion, so that by the end of those rewriting meetings, all ten program administrators had made some changes in the behaviors they were promising to make as described in the plan's objectives.

Finally, in regard to the proportion who were willing to undergo training (condition 6.4), one would have to say that the figure was again 100%. Everyone attended (and worked) during the evaluation plan rewriting sessions and doing this to such a detailed level was a new experience. Furthermore, everyone did attend the first dress rehearsal experience during which appropriate campus coordinators behaviors--as described in the evaluation plan--were modeled. Moreover, everyone did participate in the second dress rehearsal experience when they responded to prompts from Dr. Kester when he made campus on-site visits.

In conclusion, one would have to say that the proportion was 100% on all three conditions on which estimates can be made at this time (conditions 6.1, 6.2, and 6.4). Such a high proportion must have generated enough of a "critical mass" on these three so that the press from all three conditions and hence this cluster were toward the successful development and implementation of the Handicap Evaluation system.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Possible answers to the question, "Why has the handicap program's evaluation system been so successful for so long (8 years)?" have been explored in this paper. Five major predisposing factors have been suggested. Those factors were:

1. The program's evaluation system was seen as "invented here by us, the major players"--that is, by the district administrator and each of the nine campus coordinators,

2. There was an adequate level of trust between all the major players,

3. There existed at least three supportive organizational factors (special funding that required accountability, a manageable span of control, and line authority on the part of the ten program managers),

4. The nine different forms of "resistance to innovation" were overcome, and

5. There was a "readiness for innovation."

A retrospective look at the experiences involved in the development and implementation of the handicap evaluation system within the context of these five predisposing factors together with a retrospective application of a rough force field analysis showed clearly that the handicap evaluation system would enjoy long-run success. Not only that, if this assessment had been carried out as a forecast in the early stages of planning it could have correctly estimated the system's success rate early enough to assist planners in deciding whether to continue, revise or abort their efforts.

Appendix 1

FORCE-FIELD ANALYSIS AND FACTORS

Goal: Long Run Success for the Los Angeles Community College District's Management and Evaluation System for the Handicap Program

FORCES FOR	FORCES AGAINST
Factor 1: The system was perceived as having been "invented here by us, the major players."	
Factor 2: There was an "adequate level of trust between the major players."	
Factor 3: The system was supported by three organizational characteristics: it received "special funding" that required fiscal and educational accountability; it involved a manageable "span of control;" and its ten managers held "line authority."	
Factor 4: The nine forms of "resistance to innovation" were overcome.*	
Factor 5: A substantial number (24) of the 27 "conditions of readiness for innovations" were favorable.**	
TOTAL 5	0

*Please see "Part 4: Factor 4" of this paper for more detail.
**Please see "Part 5: Factor 5" of this paper for more detail.
Note: As regards Factor 5, it should be emphasized that of the 27 conditions of readiness for change," 24 were estimated as having been favorable, only one (condition 2.1) as having been unfavorable, and only two (conditions 6.3 and 6.5) as unknown.

Appendix 2

COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION SERVICES

The Los Angeles County Office of Education provides various consultant services to all K-14 school districts that are located within its service area of Los Angeles County. The term "school districts" legally includes all thirty-three (33) elementary districts, all seven (7) high school districts, all forty-two (42) unified school districts, and all thirteen (13) community college districts that are contained within Los Angeles County.

In many respects the County Office acts as an intermediate unit between local school districts and state-level agencies. For example: all thirteen community college districts in Los Angeles County must submit their preliminary annual budget to the County Office by July 1. Similarly, they must also submit their final annual budgets to the County Office by September 7 of each year. Furthermore, many of the community college districts still rely on the County Office to disburse payroll checks to their employees; and, as already noted, the County Office provides various consultant services as well. One broad area within which consultant service is provided is the area of Comprehensive Educational Evaluation Assistance. Under this umbrella category are three specific consultant service areas: (1) educational program evaluation, (2) educational program audit, and (3) evaluation and research technical support. These three services areas are further broken down as follows:

I. **Educational Program Evaluation**

Consultant services in this area are intended to help school districts and schools (including community college districts and community colleges) to determine major objectives for themselves and to establish practical plans for reaching those.

County assistance is available in each of the major task areas of program evaluation:

A. Conducting Needs-Assessments--Determining the needs of a district, school, college or particular subgroup in quantifiable terms.

B. Writing Process and Product Objectives--Stating the major activities and desired program outcomes in measurable terms.

C. Developing Management Timelines--Outlining a time schedule of the tasks and responsibilities of the program personnel.

In addition, the Evaluation Improvement Program, initially funded under ESEA, Title V, Part C, provides the following services to interested districts, schools and community colleges:

D. Program evaluation workshops for mid-management personnel to improve their skills, knowledge and attitudes in the areas of program evaluation, planning and dissemination.

E. Follow-up consultant services for workshop participants who have program evaluation responsibilities.

II. Educational Program Audit

Consultant services in this area help districts, schools, and community colleges audit and validate: (a) the evaluation procedures being used in a particular program, (b) the degree to which a planned program is being implemented, including suggestions for interim improvements if such appear to be needed, and (c) the accuracy of evaluation findings. (All audit reports are presented confidentially to the chief administrative officer of the district or to his or her designee). The audit services include:

A. **Evaluation Design Review**

All aspects of the evaluation design are reviewed, including the product and process objectives, evaluation specifications, management plan and documentation, so as to insure the audit ability of the program.

B. **Program Monitoring**

The actual program operation is reviewed through use of primary source data and on-site visits to determine how well it is meeting its objectives. The auditor may recommend interim improvements to the program management, if such appear to be needed.

C. **Verification of Evaluation Findings**

In addition to commenting on the completeness of an evaluation report and its recommendations, the auditor either indicates support or disagreement with the report's conclusions concerning how well a program attained its objectives and the report's recommendations for improvement.

III. **Evaluation and Research Technical Support**

Consultant services in these areas provide technical assistance in specializations that are likely to be needed by districts, schools, and community colleges involved in evaluation or research activities.

A. **Program Evaluation Support Services:**

1. **Determining Appropriate Measurement Procedures**

Assistance in determining reliability and validity of proposed measurement techniques. The division also makes available the services of a librarian and library of

published tests and research instruments in the cognitive, affective and psychomotor areas.

2. **Determining Appropriate Data Collection Procedures**

Assistance in establishing procedures for effective collecting and monitoring systems that are suitable for process and product evaluation.

3. **Determining Appropriate Data Analysis Procedures**

Assistance in determining appropriate statistical treatment, computation and interpretation of analysis. computerized data processing and analysis is available on a cost-recovery basis.

B. **Research Support Services:**

1. **Computerized Information Retrieval System (LANCERS)**

This system provides access to such data bases as ERIC, Exceptional Child Abstracts, Psychological Abstracts and AIM/ARM (vocational and career education materials).

2. **Other Technical Assistance is Available in:**

- o Instrument construction
- o Research design including hypothesis generation
- o Proposal development
- o Demographic analysis

These three comprehensive evaluation services are made available to all of the following thirteen community college districts and twenty-two community colleges within the county.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

1. Antelope Valley Community College
2. Cerritos Community College
3. Citrus Community College
4. Compton Community College
5. El Camino Community College
6. Glendale Community College
7. Long Beach Community College
8. Los Angeles Community College
9. Mt. San Antonio Community College
10. Pasadena Area Community College
11. Rio Hondo Community College
12. Santa Clarita Community College
13. Santa Monica Community College

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

1. Antelope Valley College
2. Cerritos College
3. Citrus College
4. Compton College
5. El Camino College
6. Glendale College
7. Long Beach City College
8. East Los Angeles College
9. Los Angeles City College
10. Los Angeles Harbor College
11. Los Angeles Metropolitan College
12. Los Angeles Mission College
13. Los Angeles Pierce College
14. Los Angeles Southwest College
15. Los Angeles Trade-Tech College
16. Los Angeles Valley College
17. West Los Angeles College
18. Mt. San Antonio College
19. Pasadena City College
20. Rio Hondo College
21. College of the Canyons
22. Santa Monica College

Appendix 3

CONDITIONS RELATED TO READINESS FOR CHANGE

These conditions related to readiness for change or innovation are from a monograph by Warren Bell, Spencer Wyant, and Richard Schmuck entitled: "Diagnosing a School's Readiness for Change: What to Look for When Starting an Innovation." The monograph was edited by John McCalley and was part of the Central California Facilitator Project, Office of the Santa Clara County Superintendent of Schools. It was copyrighted in 1979. The twenty-seven (27) conditions for readiness are listed within six (6) clusters.

Cluster 1: Accessibility of Resources and Support

1.1 Extent and kind of technical knowledge needed to implement a change
1.2 Availability of technical knowledge within the school
1.3 Accessibility of technical knowledge and expertise outside the school
1.4 Availability of financial resources
1.5 Support from key administrators in the district

Cluster 2: Internal Press for Change

2.1 Proportion of individuals dissatisfied with the present situation
2.2 Proportion of individuals valuing the proposed target
2.3 Proportion of individuals who have confidence that the proposed change will bring benefits

Cluster 3: Stability of the Staff Undergoing Change

3.1 Proportion of turnover of membership of the staff
3.2 Commitment of key administrators to remaining in current positions for the duration of the change
3.3 Proportion of individuals attempting other changes
3.4 Proportion of the staff experiencing stress due to the complexity of the school organization

Cluster 4: Skill in Collaborative Group Work

4.1 Group skill in communicating accurately
4.2 Group skill in making clear decisions
4.3 Group skill in conducting effective meetings
4.4 Group skill in working effectively with diverse views, opinions, and values
4.5 Group skill in solving problems

Cluster 5: Norms Supporting Collaborative Group Work

5.1 Norms supporting collaboration
5.2 Norms supporting continued communication in emotional situations
5.3 Norms supporting perseverance in group tasks
5.4 Norms supporting individual disclosure of feelings, worries, or frustrations with the task
5.5 Norms supporting third-party helping

Cluster 6: Spirit of Risk-Taking

6.1 Proportion of individuals who are willing to risk new action on behalf of the school
6.2 Willingness of key administrators to make reciprocal changes in their behavior
6.3 Presence of charismatic leadership
6.4 Proportion of individuals willing to undergo training in new skills and behavior
6.5 Proportion of individuals experiencing stress, anxiety, or threat, regardless of the source.

SPECIFIC BIBLIOGRAPHY

The three documents that are directly related to this paper are listed below in chronological order and with their ERIC abstracts.

Schmoeller, Victoria (now Victoria Richart) and Donald Kester. "This Model Management and Evaluation System of a Large $1.5 Million Program for Handicapped Students in All Nine Los Angeles Community Colleges Provides Both Cost-Benefit and Program Quality Information." Los Angeles Community College District. In ERIC ED 148 451 (1977).

The document presents a three-level model management and evaluation system for the Los Angeles Community College District's programs for the handicapped, which meets local college, district, and state-level management and evaluation needs. Nine sections discuss: (1) the educational philosophy of the community college and the handicap programs; (2) the needs of the population in terms of physical, communication, and learning disabilities; (3) program goals in terms of facilities, special educational materials, educational and mobility assistance, transportation, and developmental services; (4) special programs at the nine colleges; (5) 1976-77 district-wide program budget; (6) 1977-78 district-wide program budget; (7) combined program areas, objectives, and cost benefit matrix; (8) evaluation procedures; and (9) selected objectives from program categories. Appended material includes a description of the three initial program evaluation services, formats of the evaluation and management plan and timeline, and a copy of a student intake form. Three bibliographies conclude the document, with the first listing 97 titles on educational program evaluation and audit, the second listing 36 titles regarding handicapped programs, and the third listing 20 titles on cost-benefit analyses. (LH)

Crummer, Karen, Yvonne Hatfield, Erika Rosemark, Michael Simone, LeAnna Watts, Victoria Richart, and Donald Kester. "Showing Off What We Do and How Well We Do it: Or How The Child Development Center Program at Nine Los Angeles Community Colleges Demonstrates Accountability." Los Angeles: Los Angeles Community College District. In ERIC ED 224 508 (1982).

Based on on-site review team visits conducted during spring 1982, this report evaluates the Educational Campus Child Development Centers (CCDC's) operating at nine of the ten campuses in the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD). After introducing the evaluation project and its participants, the report outlines the educational philosophy of the LACCD and the history and philosophy of the CCDC's. Next, the report presents brief descriptions of campus centers. Following an explanation of the organization and terminology of the evaluation report, a chart is presented showing CCDC results by program objectives associated with the following goals: (1) to enhance access to higher education for student-parents; (2) to serve as a field training site for academic departments; (3) to function as an early childhood education program; (4) to maintain an exemplary community college campus-based child development center; (5) to offer a parent involvement program; (6) to expand and enhance existing child development services. For each objective, the chart indicates person responsible, tasks involved, evaluation method, date of completion, colleges at which the objective was attained, and additional information. The next sections of the report provide evaluations for each of the campus CCDC's. Following an evaluation summary and conclusions, appendices provide a sample of forms and survey instruments used in the project. (AYC)

Kester, Donald L., Robert Garber, Michael Saluzzi, and Victoria Richart. "Possible Reasons for the Successes and Difficulties Involved in the Development and Attempted Implementation of a Counseling Evaluation Plan for Nine Colleges of the Los Angeles Community College District." Los Angeles County Office of Education, California. In ERIC ED 247 977 (1984).

This evaluative report describes the development of an evaluation plan for counseling services in the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) and analyses implementation efforts. Part I provides an overview of plan development and summarizes the plan's strengths and weaknesses. Part II discusses the role of district leadership in developing the evaluation plan, focusing on the involvement of the LACCD chancellor and board, middle management personnel, the Measures of Effectiveness committee, and counseling chairs. After part III analyzes levels of counselor cooperation, part IV examines the major characteristics of the plan, reviewing its similarities to four kinds of studies (objectives-based, accountability, management information system, and experimental research); and indicating that it is a questions-oriented evaluation plan. In part V, the evaluation plan is presented. Specific objectives are delineated for major goal categories (i.e., recruitment, entering students, continuing students, existing students, and other). For each objective, tasks to be performed and methods of measuring task accomplishment are specified, and space is provided for evaluating implementation success. Part VI examines reasons for the partial failure of the implementation of the plan as foreseen, focusing on organizational differences and resistance to change. Finally, part VII reviews the actual carry-over of the plan. Extensive appendices include relevant forms, campus evaluation reports, a list of counseling functions, and a nine-page bibliography. (LAL)

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Del M. "Counselor Accountability Model of Grossmont College--A Working Paper." Grossmont College. In ERIC ED 214 581 (1981).

Bell, Warren E., Spencer H. Wyant, and Richard A Schmuck. "Diagnosing a School's Readiness for Change: What to Look for When Starting an Innovation," John McCalley, ed. Central California Facilitator Project, Santa Clara, California. Office of the Santa Clara County Superintendent of School, 1979.

Bloom, B.S. and others. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I:Cognitive Domain. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956.

Borich, Gardy D. Evaluating Educational Programs and Products. Englewood Cliffs: Educational Technology Publications, 1974.

_____. "Evaluation Models: A Question of Purpose not Terminology." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Spring 1983, Vol. 5, No. 1, 61-63.

Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley. "Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research on Teaching," N. L. Gage, ed. Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Cherdack, Arthur N. "A Changing Ballgame for Researchers." Community and Junior College Journal. November 1980. Volume 51, No. 3, 6-8.

Cohen, Ruth, William Turner, and Jean Wiener. Educational Program Audit Handbook. Downey, California: Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools. In ERIC ED 084 664 (1972).

Cook, D. L. "Program Evaluation and Review Techniques, Applications in Education." U.S. Office of Education Cooperative Monograph, 17 (OE-12024) 1966.

Cronback, Lee J. and others. Toward Reform of Program Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

CTB/McGraw-Hill. Standards for Evaluations of Educational Programs, Projects, and Materials. San Francisco: The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1981.

Dickey, Barbara. "Utilization of Evaluations of Small-scale Innovative Educational Projects." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. Nov.-Dec. 1980. Volume 2, No. 6, 65-77.

Educational Testing Service. "The Community College Goals Inventory." Educational Testing Service provides a computer report showing such items as goal area summaries for each group and goal area discrepancies.

Hale, Norman. "Problem-Solving Techniques for Administrators." ACSA School Management Digest, Series 1, Number 11. Eugene, Oregon: Association of California School Administrators, Oregon University. In ERIC ED 151 894 (1977).

Hoss, Marvin A. "A Study of Counseling Services and the Development of a Survey Instrument at Miami-Dade Junior College." Miami-Dade Junior College. In ERIC ED 021 265 (1968).

Isaac, Stephen and William B. Michael. Handbook in Research and Evaluation. San Diego: Robert R. Knapp, 1972.

Jenson, Bob and others. "Student Services Program Review Model." Sacramento: American River College, California Association of Community Colleges and others, 1984.

Koltai, Leslie and Lowell Erickson. "Statesmanship and Survival. Community and Junior College Journal. Volume 50, No. 4. December-January 1979-80, 6-9.

Kossen, Stan. The Human Side of Organizations. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978.

Krathwohl, D. R., B. S. Bloom, and B. B. Masia. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956.

Kuhl, Edward C., Jr. "Do We Make a Difference?--New Directions in Evaluation." Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association. In ERIC ED 031 731 (1969).

Massachusetts State Department of Education. "Force-Field Analysis." Boston, August, 17 pp. In ERIC ED 153 190 (1976).

Metfessel, Newton S., William B. Michael, and Donald A. Kirsner. "Instrumentation of Bloom's and Krathwohl's Taxonomies for the Writing of Educational Objectives." Reprinted from Psychology in the Schools, Volume VI, No. 3, July 1969, 227-231.

Olson, Gerald T. and Don Cornelson. "Formulating, Evaluating, and Auditing the Rio Hondo College Counseling Program." Whittier, California: Rio Hondo Community College, Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools. In ERIC ED 160 177 (1978).

"Program Evaluator's Guide: The Evaluation Improvement Program." California State Department of Education. Education Testing Service, 1979. (Other related publications are also available).

Richart, Victoria and Donald Kester. "Handicap Program Evaluation Reports." Los Angeles, California: Los Angeles Community College District, 1977-78 and 78-79, 1980, 1981, 1984.

Selgas, James W. "Student Services: An Evaluation Over Time, 1972-1976. Research Report 16." Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Harrisburg Area Community College. In ERIC ED 148 408 (1977).

Sheldon, Stephen M. and Clive L. Grafton. "Raison d'Etre" Students." Community and Junior College Journal. Volume 53, No. 3, November 1982, 19-20.

Stake, Robert. "Persuasions Not Models." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. Volume 3, No. 1, January-February 1981, 83-84.

Stufflebeam, Daniel L. and William J. Webster. "An Analysis of Alternative Approaches to Evaluation." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. Volume 2, No. 3, June, 1980.

Weinstein, M. S. "The Role of Trust in Program Evaluation: Some Guidelines for the Perplexed Administrator." The Canadian Psychologist, Volume 13, No. 3, July 1972.

West, Phyllis, Mary Hearne, and Donald Kester. "Report on a Needs Assessment and Evaluation of a Drug Education Program." Los Angeles: Los Angeles Valley College. In ERIC ED 122 905 (1976).

Workman, John F. and Donald L. Kester. "Down the Financial Drain: A College Mental Health Program Provided Through an On-Campus Psychological Services Center By a Clinical Psychologist and Four Doctoral Psychology Interns Goes 'Down the Drain.'" Los Angeles: Los Angeles Valley College. In ERIC ED 221 258 (1982).

Workman, John F. and others. "Mental Health/Counseling Needs Assessment." Los Angeles: Los Angeles Valley College. In ERIC ED 219 101 (1981).

Worthen, Blaine R. and James R. Sanders. Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice. Belmont, California: Charles A. Jones, Inc., 1974.

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE
FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
OCT 1 8 1985